Máté SZABÓ
Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8466-5573

The Regional Development of Democratization and Civil Society: Transition, Consolidation, Hybridization, Globalization – Taiwan and Hungary[1]

Abstract: Different starting points, similar processes and different outcomes can be identified when comparing East Central Europe and East and South Asia. The two regions face similar global challenges, follow regional patterns of democratization and face crises. In communist times, East Central Europe was economically marginalized in the world economy, while some parts of Asia integrated well in the global economy under authoritarian rule. Europeanization and a favorable external environment encouraged the former communist countries to opt for the Western-style rule of law and democracy. Different external factors helped the Third Wave democracies in Asia, especially South Korea and Taiwan, which benefited from the support of the United States and other global economic, military and cultural partnerships to develop their human rights culture and democracy while facing their totalitarian counterparts, namely the People's Republic of China and North Korea. The very different positions Taiwan and Hungary have in their respective regions follow from the different capacities of their transformation management since 1988–1989. Taiwan preserved its leading role and stable democracy despite the threat to its sovereignty from the People's Republic of China. Hungary never had such an influential and problematic neighbor and was ensured security and welfare partnership by the European Union, which Taiwan lacked. While Taiwan was less secure, economic and social conditions were more favorable for democratization than those in Hungary. Hungary, in turn, held a leading position in democratization processes in the period of post-communist transition which was lost during the crisis and conflicts of the last decade (after 2006 and especially since 2010). Despite the fact that liberalization prepared the way for peaceful transition in both countries and resulted in similar processes of democratic consolidation in the 1990s, Hungary joined the 'loser' group in its region, whereas Taiwan is among the top 'winning' countries in its region. Taiwan at the moment is starting comprehensive reform processes toward enhanced democracy, civil rights and the rule of law, and Hungarian development is criticized by many external and internal analysts as straying from the path of European-style consolidated democracies towards illiberal trends and hybridization. Western global concepts of democratization may help to identify similarities and differences, and compare stronger and weaker factors in the democratic transitions in Asia and Europe within the Third Wave democracies.

Key words: democratization, hybridization, regional development, Central Europe, East Asia, Democracy, party system, political protest, social movements, mobilization, authoritarianism, competitive authoritarianism

Introduction

The paper is based on the results of discussions from global and European political science and international relations, including:

– the "end of transition paradigm" (Carothers, 2002);
– "anti-democracy promotion and democracy promotion/development strategies" (Carothers, 2015; Whitehead, 2014);
– "hybridization and new authoritarianism" (Diamond, 2002; Morlino, 2009; Krasztev, Til, 2015; Levitsky-Way, 2010; Babayan, Risse, 2015; Soest, Whitehead, 2015; *Authoritarianism*, 2015).

Carothers' (2002) seminal work on the end of the transition paradigm heralded a new era of studies on the many kinds of the Third Wave transitions. Literature on illiberal tendencies, hybridization and new authoritarianism has resulted in a much-debated new approach. A few analysts, such as Ekiert (2011), Miszlivetz (2012), Carothers and Brechenmacher (2014), Krasztev, Til (2015), Whitehead (2016), Szabó (2015) – have tried to reach a conclusion on the challenge of the crisis for post-authoritarian and post-communist civil societies.

However, Dahrendorf (1990), in his famous stage model, made it clear that, after the emergence of a new civil society, its political culture will mature only after a long and conflict-ridden period leading to the establishment of a new constitution, political system and market economy. Linz and Stepan (1996) reflected on civil society as a prerequisite of democratic consolidation embedded in the framework of democracy, the market economy, statehood, and the new rule of law. Democracy in relation to civil society was the precondition for democratic stabilization and consolidation, as defined by Wolfgang Merkel (1994) and his various research groups. Within literature, after the global civil society enthusiasm of the 20th century, a more self-critical and self-reflective approach emerged, focusing on the effects of economic and political crises on civic development (Berg-Schlosser, 2015; Shin, Kim, 2016), which will be reflected in this project.

Transition literature on South European and South American trends had become elite-centric. Later, the analysis of East Asian and Eastern European transitions, mainly the latter, brought civil society to the fore (Arato, 1992). To discuss the democratic progress, it is important to differentiate the concepts of liberalization, democratic transition and democratic consolidation. For Juan J. Linz and Alfred Stepan (1996), the first indicates a non-democratic state with a mix of policy and social changes, such as reduced censorship of the media and toleration of opposition; the second indicates free competitive elections; and the last indicates that democracy has behaviorally, attitudinally and constitutionally become 'the only game in town.' They proposed five necessary arenas as working definitions of consolidated democracy: civil society, political society, rule of law, usable bureaucracy, and economic society (Linz, Stepan, 1996, pp. 1–11). Consequently, here we will adopt the above-mentioned criteria for discussion, for two reasons: (1) their comprehensiveness and theoretical coherence (not to clarify all prominent definitions from different viewpoints); (2) it is possible to dynamically and strictly assess the progress and regression of consolidation, which could not be achieved by negative single-index concepts. For Linz and Stepan, civil society refers to self-organizing groups, movements and individuals, relatively autonomous from the state, that attempt to articulate values, create associations, and advance their interests. Thus, in this arena, they believed that the primary organizing principle would be freedom of association and communication; furthermore, rule of law which might establish legal guarantees, would be one of the necessary supporting conditions from other arenas (Linz, Stepan, 1996, pp. 7, 14).

As analysis of the development of civil society in former communist countries has shown, a varied social map of new civil societies has emerged (Ekiert, Kubik, 2014; Bába, 2016; Ekiert, Foa, 2011, 2017), with Central and Eastern Europe similar to established European models, and Russia and post-Soviet Central Asia under new authoritarian regimes. In the process of EU accession, the Central and Eastern European and Baltic regions made progress towards European and global models. Risks to the democratization processes were stressed in the transition literature, in contrast to the evolution/progress-based strict stage models (Schmitter, Schneider, 2014). Issues of hybridization have long been discussed, especially related to the multiplicity of forms of political participation and political conflict resolution (Morlino, 2009; Levitsky, Way, 2010). For a long time, Central and Eastern Europe was seen as a success story compared to other regions (Merkel, 2010). However, problems of consolidation and economic and political crises produced counter-trends to democratic consolidation in Hungary and, recently, elsewhere (Ekiert, 2011). Hybridization and illiberal tendencies endanger pluralism and tolerance, core values of the old and new civil societies, and weaken the rule of law, enabling government intervention in the autonomy of civil society (Bozóki, 2015).

Central and Eastern Europe: a system transition towards European civil society?

In Poland, the mass movement Solidarity, in Czechoslovakia, the small intellectual network Charter 77, in Hungary, different networks of critical intellectuals – all articulated the demands of civil society (Bába, 2016). National autonomy and independence as an opportunity for the development of civil society within the individual communist countries was limited by Soviet intervention; in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, and in the Soviet-supported Polish military takeover in Poland in 1981, the Soviet Union maintained the forced integration of the former socialist countries.

Crises in the planned economy, centralized one-party rule, and international, East-West conflicts made autonomous national policies more possible within the Eastern bloc in the 1970s and 80s. The general trend in Central and Eastern Europe was the use of the political sphere by the communist elite to gain popular support by formulating autonomous foreign and domestic policies. There were some experimental openings towards civil society in Hungary and Poland (Arato, 1992; Frentzel-Zagórska, 1990) but authoritarian patterns were simultaneously reinforced and civil society survived in a 'catacomb' existence. However, the liberalization processes in Poland and Hungary opened up political space for the development of true civil society and political opposition (Falk, 2003).

The legacy of the past, of pre-communist and anti-communist civil society played a role in the new beginning. Social solidarity, Christian and Catholic social and moral values, national traditions and democratic aspirations established a strong civil society as a mobilizing force in Poland throughout the 1980s (Ekiert, Kubik, 2014). The organizational and symbolic unity of Solidarity (Ekiert, 1996) could not be preserved in the framework of pluralist democracy after 1989. Strong organizational unity even hindered the development and differentiation of a multi-party system. Compared with Poland, there has been considerable political stability in Hungary since 1956 (Tőkés, 1996).

Kádárist policy opened up possibilities for the second economy, and the formation of civil society on the level of economy. A much less politicized civil society emerged in this way in Hungary than in Poland (Michta, 1997; Miszlivetz, 1999; Renwick, 2014). Fragmentation and differentiation of opposition intellectual groups and circles had already developed before system transformation, and their capacity for political bargaining with reformers from the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party were much more formidable than in Poland. No huge waves of repression comparable to martial law in Poland, took place in Hungary after the 1956 revolution and its aftermath. Thus, no umbrella organization representing national solidarity was established beyond the temporary unity of opposition groups which emerged in order to bargain with the communists at the Round Table (Tőkés, 1996).

Civil society developed in Poland and Hungary within the established framework of statehood, which enabled the global and international opening up of a network of NGOs supported by the government and foreign aid. Czechoslovakia's historical background to the regime change is the normalization process introduced after 1968, with the strong backing of the post-Stalinist Soviet leadership (Bába, 2016). All reform communists were excluded from the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and even Soviet reforms of the 1980s were ignored by the communist elite, as in the GDR. Opposition groups developed in an intellectual subculture against the old system, and strict political-administrative control forced them to be united. Strong repression and rigidity of the communist rulers helped to bring national and democratic issues together in opposition discussions. Political solidarity from non-conventional artistic groups and former reform communists emerged in the form of Charter 77.

The processes of institutionalization and differentiation are connected in Czechoslovakia (Olson, 1997) with the re-emergence of the issues relating to separation, Czech and Slovak nation-building and state-building, and the eventual split. The difference in political culture between the more Westernized and industrialized Czech regions, and the less developed Slovak regions suffering from socio-economic and ethnic problems, as well as the unresolved conflict among factions in the new political elite, led to separation and the peaceful dissolution of the federation into two sovereign states in 1992. The potential for nationalist mobilization is more serious in Slovakia, while the political traditions and culture of the Czech regions have a more Western-European civic orientation (Olson, 1997). Czech civil society has been able to develop without significant political interference, while in Slovakia civic groups have been united against the authoritarian experimentation with nationalist mobilization and the anti-Western attitude of some political groupings.

The activities of the US-based international philanthropist George Soros began in Hungary in the mid-1980s, as it was then the most open country in the region in which to support the development of an open society in a former communist country. Among others, the Soros Foundation became an important regional player, and was one of the first to bring international aid to Eastern civic initiatives from the material and cultural resources of Western civil societies. The Soros network spread throughout the whole region after 1989, and helped the development of civic engagement with material support, by providing training abroad and especially by facilitating networking among Eastern civic initiatives, and between Eastern and Western civil societies (Quigley, 1997).

Protest movements and nation-wide alternative civic organizations emerged as leading forces in the democratic breakthrough of 1988–1990. The resurrection of civil society, self-organizing, bottom-up approaches, new groups of elites and competition between them, and new organizational forms fast gave shape to the civic sphere, where, instead of the former 'catacomb' networks, nation-wide mass mobilizations took place and reshaped the state and society (Arato, 1992). Civic and political space opened up for the umbrella organizations, all-embracing national fronts, thanks to agreements at Round Table talks involving civic and political forces to constitute a new political community, national institutions and national leaders, renewing the basis of the political community (Bába, 2016). The movement organizations and political leadership of the first democratization period had to be restructured by new political conflicts. As long as the communist party maintained political and administrative control, the new movements were connected in a united front. After the dissolution of the monopoly of power, and the establishment of new political opportunities, new leaderships and ideologies emerged to fill the pluralistic political field, and the formerly united civil society was fragmented into various movements and counter-movements.

Throughout the phases of system transformation, socio-political changes took place. Social movements mobilized by the crisis and protests set up transitory coalitions with temporary organizational consequences. The emergence of a party system is an important step in institutionalization (Dawisha, Parrot, 1997). With free elections, the distribution of power and formulation of national policy converge in the setup of new institutional structures, which represent national interests within pluralistic, conflict-based modern societies. Civil society, with its network, is established on the basis of the new economy, constitutionalism, the rule of law, and regional and global networks. Associations, foundations, and different types of NGOs are established. Civic activism develops in a progressive way, if it is not hindered by wars, civil wars, ethnic conflicts or resurgent authoritarianism.

The processes of system transformation in Central and Eastern Europe had a similar dynamic, but with considerable differences. There are some common elements, based on common historical and cultural heritage and geographic, economic and social ties to Western Europe in this region, especially compared to post-communist development in the Balkans and in the former Soviet Union. One of the important distinctive features of the transition in Central and Eastern Europe is the absence of violent ethnic and territorial conflicts, unlike those which followed the dissolution of multi-ethnic federal states such as the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia. Despite the fact that territorially-based ethnic minorities do exist, the violent mobilization of the majorities did not occur. Ethnic violence seems to be under control in this region, where new political institutions, constitutional frameworks and political parties are accepted as channels for the distribution of power. The Europeanization process, the dynamics of European integration and its effects produced a largely supportive trend for the development of Central and Eastern European civil society.

The international, as well global and regional, dimension of democratization processes was clear within the revitalization process of civil society. International organizations and foreign governments had to become key supporters, as the new capitalists were less involved in philanthropy in the new market system. Government support is, on one hand,

rare during the transition to a market economy; on the other hand, NGOs do not always ask for government support. The scarcity of internal resources is one reason why foreign, especially international and Western, aid was and is so important for the new sector of NGOs in the new EU member states (Jensen, Miszlivetz, 2006).

The demonstration effect of Western models is also very important in the rebirth of NGOs. Pre-communist traditions were broken by communist totalitarianism, and the government-led pseudo-autonomous organizations of the communist period did not provide a sustainable model for the new beginning after 1989. The geographical and cultural presence of the Western European, especially German, model of society is characteristic of democratization in Hungary, but Anglo-Saxon, especially US-American, material and intellectual support has also been influential through the institutions and programs affiliated with the US Embassy and the network of the Soros Foundation (Quigley, 1997). Internationalization, globalization, and regionalization were especially important for the emerging or re-emerging civil movements, characterized by the 'poor' situation, scarcity of resources, and lack of experience with pluralist conditions. Poor Eastern movements were looking for richer Western partners and cooperation, and there were attempts among Eastern movements to network beyond national levels and increase the effectiveness of their own resources (Schreier, 2015).

Hungarian civil society remained weaker than that in Poland even after the transition, despite a considerable amount of Western aid. In Hungary, domestic civil society never reached a level of strength comparable to that of its counterpart in Poland (which included a large independent trade union). By the end of the 1980s, organizations which had emerged to fill the void (Danube mobilization, Hungarian Democratic Forum) quickly transformed themselves into political parties during the democratization process, and this very fact left civil society relatively empty, resulting to some extent in a 'civil vacuum' in the new Hungarian democracy. Civic organizations and NGOs may not have lacked financial backing but they did lack membership, supporters and local networks. This weakness can partly explain the low level of civic mobilization in Hungary (compared to Poland) and the weakness of watchdogs during the 1990s.

The general attitude of the new regime was positive, affirmative and helpful towards NGOs, and the legal and political situation was often reformed with the aim of improvement. One general difference between NGOs and civil society in stable Western democracies compared to those in post-totalitarian/authoritarian former communist countries is the higher level of innovation in the latter group compared to the former, but more efficiency and stability in the former group than the latter. Conditions in some Western democracies for NGOs are stable, legitimate, and effective in the long run, while conditions in new democracies are in constant flux, and therefore their legitimacy and effectiveness can be weak (Kuti, Sebestyén, 2004).

By joining NATO, the OECD and the EU, Hungary became part of the circle of donor states within Europe and the world system. The level of governmental financial support is still below the average of the welfare democracies, thus analysts still encourage or demand more and more government support in order to finance the functions (in culture, welfare, education, etc.) that have been abandoned by government agencies and overtaken by NGOs. While the cry for more government support has been one of the repetitive echoes of discussions on NGO finances since regime transition, at the same

time they demand self-government and autonomy. To find a compromise between these two is the task of the schemes developed to finance NGOs in Hungary, based upon internal resources and encouraging private initiatives. The systems of tax remission and tax donation could be seen as a large macro-system of citizen re-education for philanthropy and civic engagement. On the other hand, this 're-schooling society' process is based upon the changing political opportunity structures, which affects the government policy of NGO financing. The present system is a top-down scheme, although the basic idea was bottom-up, based upon liberal philosophy.[2] Nowadays, NGOs in Hungary act in the multi-layered environment of the global, EU, national, and local policy actors, who should develop their resource-mobilization strategies in this multi-organizational field with different types of stakeholders.

Transition, consolidation and civil society in East Asia

A general starting point for discussion is whether the democratic transitions in Asia could at all be interpreted in the same theoretical framework as democratic transitions in other parts of the world (Cotton, 1997; Shin, Kim, 2016). In the 1990s, research on democratic consolidation was already raising serious questions around East Asian Third Wave democracies, using various arguments which mostly still remain relevant today. As a counterweight to homogenizing approaches, a regional analysis for limits and achievements of democratization was proposed, which is still under development. Western-style pluralist opposition as an important agent and actor against the authoritarian regime was apparently a less marked phenomenon in East Asia than in Southern and Eastern Europe. The blooming economy under authoritarian but benevolent regimes (Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore) established more openness to the authoritarian past than in Eastern Europe or South America.

However, there are many aspects warranting comparison between post-authoritarian Asian and Central and Eastern European countries, based upon the following issues:
– Struggling with the past;
– Lack of, or weakness of, human rights culture;
– Instability of the constitution and human rights regimes after transition;

---

[2]   The general state of civil society was depicted in 2009, and continues to be relevant today: "Despite the high level of social self-organization, there is only a limited opportunity for social participation in political-economic decisions. In fact, real civic control, influence and enforcement of interests are hardly typical for the sector […]. The gradual devaluation of the civil sphere was caused among other, by the lack of citizenry (citoyen), aborted historical development, or [...] the 'defective protest culture' also contributed to that phenomena just like the lack of trust and solidarity between citizens, citizen's legitimacy deficit against the state or bad regulations (a 'civil' organization founded by the state and the local government) [...] regardless of the increasing economic power of the civil sector, the status of its economic base still cannot be considered stable [...] Hungarian civil society cannot make its voice heard in domestic politics and is even incapable of participating on equal terms in political decision making with the representatives of the central and local (municipalities) power. […] over the past 20 years the Hungarian civil sphere has been unable to create and strengthen such institutions (e.g. social publicity, protests) that would ensure society's self-protection against the abuses of the state (and the parties) and that would provide some help battling democracy deficits" (Fodor, Kern, 2009, pp. 189–191).

– Tendency towards economic and financial crises;
– External factors, such as being surrounded by authoritarian or regimes, local conflicts and tensions, migration waves.

This research paper attempts to discuss the different forms of civic engagement and partisanship, development of civil society, and sustainability of the achievement of civic development. The two regions are far away from each other in space and in terms of cultural tradition, and there are manifold differences, but they are bound by global networks, and in this way they are both divided and integrated by the effects of globalization. In both regions, Central and Eastern Europe and post-authoritarian East and South East Asia, a wide body of literature has been established regarding some focal points which are characteristic for each region. In Central and Eastern Europe, the tradition of the planned economy, the need to rebuild the market economy after communism, the opportunities for European networking, extended welfare services and the tradition of interwar developments can be identified (Dawisha, Parrot, 1997); and in Asia, integration into the world economy, the successes of economic development under authoritarian rule, the challenge of the poorly dealt with authoritarian past, civilian-military relations, and the relationship between ancient Asian culture and religion and Western-based global human rights values and concepts are the main lines of differentiation (Diamond, Plattner, 1998; McAllister, 2016; Croissant, 2004).

Shin (2008, 2016), Fukuyama (2012) and others established a network of analytical aspects for the interpretation of problems and achievements of new democracies in East and South East Asia, relating to the Third Wave and subsequent consolidation:

– East Asia is a region where the Third Wave of democratization could not achieve sustainable results, and different tendencies towards illiberal democracies are documented;
– Some of the important authoritarian regimes are located there, especially China, North Korea, and Vietnam (and Russia nearby);
– China is traditionally the core state of reference for Asian civilizations;
– Authoritarian-capitalist states as China, Vietnam and especially Singapore maintain an alternative to democracy with high opportunity costs and support authoritarian nostalgia for former developmental authoritarian regimes;
– There is no regional organization for implementing human rights and democratic values as efficiently as the EU; ASEAN has a much weaker profile;
– Benevolent authoritarian dictatorships have a long tradition in the region, from ancient to modern times;
– Economic success, wellbeing and development is associated with the current authoritarian regime ('China-factor,' Singapore as a success story);
– Traditional value systems; 'Asian values' of Confucianism have a contemporary influence which is different than Western-style human rights and democracy;
– Civil society is much less developed and younger than the authoritarian-bureaucratic state; political culture has a hybrid character within the region, involving authoritarian, anti-liberal and democratic and liberal elements;
– There is no general, regional consensus on the 'rules of the game,' unlike in the EU;
– The persistence of the idea of benevolent authoritarian rulers, and the need for 'strong men' as top leaders;

- Less tolerance than in pluralist US- or European-based systems towards press freedom;
- Weak roots of party systems, which need more experience of periodic elections than the 'double test' of Huntington; two peaceful changes of the governmental power;
- Weak civil society, combined with a new type of political mobilization in the new civic culture, living together with deeply rooted traditional forms of legitimacy;
- A narrow, Schumpeterian concept of electoral democracy, spread out and stabilized as a starting point for further democratization.

Japan, South Korea and Taiwan are countries where liberal democracy has proved to be stable in the long term, but only with the help of majoritarian electoral systems, hegemonic or two-party systems, and strong ideas of an enemy among the authoritarian states (e.g. China, North Korea), or some combination of these elements. Here, development of a middle class, the mobilization of civil society and value changes in favor of the rule of law and democracy have helped to consolidate democratic regimes, albeit not without serious problems. In other cases, cycles of crises have annulled or hybridized democratic regimes, as in the case of the Philippines or Thailand (Croissant, 2004).

All of these trends and patterns are not far removed from those observed in Eastern Europe in the 1990s. The emerging new political culture was lacking the values and experience of tolerance, multi-party systems were still under development, and traditional values – of course, different than those found in Asia – became influential once more after the fall of communism. The rejection of the old regime was more radical, as well as the discontinuity inherent in the transition away from the communist planned economy and system of scarcity. Meanwhile, urbanization, modernization, and even globalization characterized the fast-growing and innovative economies of the authoritarian developing dictatorships of Taiwan, South Korea or Singapore. In this way, Southern Europe was more similar to East Asia, in that no radical change of property or economic system occurred there alongside democratization, at least not in such a radical way as in the former communist countries.[3]

Thinking back to Central and Eastern Europe at the time of the transition, more optimistic predictions for that region were based very much on the external framework, the prospect of EU accession and Western aid, as well as hopes for the newly emerging market economies. EU accession and the process of Europeanization helped to build a consensus among the different factions of the political elite, and Europeanization seemed to have great potential to influence the new democracies and market economies of Eastern Europe, despite the conflicts which emerged from the dissolution of former Yugoslavia. However, the common denominator for the new South and East Asian democracies was less clear, and the development of ASEAN never provided a similar dynamic to the Europeanization process at that time. On the global scene, China was an emerging actor, and the US supported democratization and consolidation processes in the region, not with the same intensity and engagement in each and every country, but according to the regional interests of their foreign policy. Democratic consolidation in Japan, Taiwan

---

[3] The prospects for consolidation were rather moderate, as stated: "In short, where democratic consolidation has been proceeding, it has not always established the conditions that are fundamental for the reproduction for a Western-style democracy. Finally, the present era [end of the 90s – M.Sz.] may not be as favorable to democratization as the latter part of the 1980s was. In particular, the imperatives of globalization may reduce the attractiveness of democracy" (Cotton, 1997, p. 116).

and South Korea, which are considered to be stable, free and liberal democracies in the region, is partly due to the US presence and support based on security concerns in these countries, with powerful enemies on the other side (Diamond, 1997; Shin, Kim, 2016; McAllister, 2016; Croissant, 2017).

The Third Wave produced a 'muddling through' of unconsolidated systems, and the emergence of a 'reverse wave' against democratization can be documented and observed in the region. According to Larry Diamond (1997, 1998, 2014), the role and importance of external factors and their interplay with internal factors was the key to consolidation in Taiwan and South Korea. Their role within the global economy, internal economic and technological development and the effect of this on the social structure produced a unique Westernization, combined with their role in the Asian security and general policy of the US, i.e. their geopolitical situation.[4]

Discussions surrounding consolidation have emphasized the wide range of democracy promotion activities (Carothers, 2015) in the form of various resources that Eastern Europe enjoyed, e.g. being targeted by the developed democracies from Western Europe and elsewhere. This kind of help reached the East and South Asian countries in the form of new or long-established cultural and educational exchange, mainly from the US/Canada/Australia, and to a lesser extent from Western Europe. Strengthening party systems, civil societies, public media discourse, and the inclusion of passive citizens in political mobilization posed similar challenges to Eastern Europe, but the different structures of the pre-democratic authoritarian regimes demanded different strategies and concepts of democratic aid. Moreover, global structures, such as the UN global human rights regime, which was established or re-established after the Cold War, made similar challenges relating to the rule of law, legal culture and institutional reform of the two regions. The introduction of new institutions and the growth of a new culture of human rights presupposed civic activism by human rights initiatives, which had been developing since the transition in both regions. However, civic activism has a different profile in the two regions. Asian values of collectivism, the importance of the public good, deference to authority, and communitarianism are missing in Eastern Europe, where the

---

[4] "With the reunification of Germany, these two democracies [Taiwan and South Korea – M.S.] are now unique in their status as divided countries, facing threats to their very existence from communist regimes of the same nationality that claim sovereignty over them. […] The resulting threats to the national security of the two democracies have slowed efforts to democratize civil-military relations and to dismantle the vestiges of authoritarian national – security laws and structures. At the same time, the quest for international legitimacy and Western (especially U.S.) support have driven forward the processes of democratization in many other respects […] The dilemma is particularly acute for Taiwan, given mainland China's economic dynamism and substantially greater size and power. Yet precisely because Taiwan is so threatened – and by one of the world's most authoritarian states – democracy has become a resource and a legitimating symbol in its quest for an accepted place in world affairs" (Diamond, 1997: XXXIV–XXXV). "The export dependence of Korea and Taiwan has pushed political development in a democratic direction. Closer economic and political integration with the advanced industrial democracies […] will become virtually impossible if these two countries cannot implement and maintain democratic systems. At the same time, however, middle classes aware of the need for socioeconomic stability to maintain international competitiveness have not been sympathetic to militant mobilization by labor and other organized groups. Thus the high degree of involvement in the world economy also generates a bias for stability and moderation that tends to limit the potential for polarizing conflict over socioeconomic issues" (Diamond, 1997: XXXV).

pseudo-collectivism of communism gave rise to individualism, lack of trust in institutions and communities and neglecting the public good (Hankiss, 1990).

Philippe C. Schmitter (1997) made a clear-cut and systematic differentiation between civil society in the East and West. He stressed that the diffusion of Western civil society reached Asia by way of colonization, cultural globalization and economic ties, as well as migration (Chinese, Korean, Taiwanese, etc. communities in the US, Australia, Europe). He mentioned the possibility of initiating and implementing the role of civic associations in the development of rule of law procedures, and legal and administrative reforms after the transition (such as bar associations, alumni associations, etc.) drawing from Western and global rule of law cultures. Based upon his own earlier research on neo-corporatism, Schmitter characterized civic associations employing Asian values as intermediaries between the state and society at the level of local, regional and professional organizations and self-regulation. In his view, in Asia, the Hegelian-German-European polarization and clear divide between state and civil society is less pronounced, and even Hegel in his *Philosophy of Law* categorized corporate associations as mediators between state and society. Following the French 19th century Liberal thinker, Alexis de Tocqueville, Schmitter argues that the authoritarian regimes in Asia built such strong connections between state and society in the liberalization phase that these mechanisms were able to survive during the latter phases of democratic consolidation.

This organized, embedded transformation, as in the case of Taiwan, enabled a non-violent and less conflictual regime change, although the inherited informal mechanisms of the previous regime may prove hindrances and obstacles to legal change in the direction of a Western-style human rights regime in the long run. This point makes the Taiwan-Hungary comparison of system transition later in this study particularly pertinent. The reform-oriented elite factions played an important role in the two transitions, despite the remarkable differences between Taiwan and Hungary in many respects.

The unique case of Taiwan (Chu, 1998; McAllister, 2016), where the state was based on the Kuonmintang army and administration coming from the mainland China after defeat by the communists, produced a militarized, Leninist-style regime in Taiwan, which copied/reproduced certain characteristics of the Russian and Chinese party-state (Cheng, Haggard, 1992). Instead of conflict between state and civil society, both the state and civil society were organized based on the top-down military and political network of the mainland Chinese elite. This elite penetrated the civilian population, military, state and society and suppressed the local Taiwanese elites for a long time, forcing them to build up a counter-elite against the state and military. The strong interconnectedness of state-Kuomintang party-army established the conflict between civil society and the military regime. This was also present in other Asian post-war authoritarian/developmental regimes, but in the case of Taiwan it was strengthened by the conflict between the KMT and PRC, as well as with local Taiwanese groups (Wu, Wen, 1992). This division was established during the liberalization and democratization processes as the main axis of conflict, i.e. the split between the major parties, the Kuomintang party versus the Taiwan-based pro-independence Democratic Progressive Party, which has been the mainstay of party competition since 1986. Political parties emerged from both factions, but the two camps, the Blue (the KMT, who came from mainland China and hope for some kind of reintegration with the mainland) and the Green (the DPP, focused on Taiwanese cultural and political independence and recruit-

ed from groups who have been based in Taiwan longer), still form the main dividing line in the political and social system. Such a marked division, going back to the political and social realm of the former authoritarian system, is mirrored in Eastern Europe in the divide between the former nomenclature and non-elite groups and religiosity vs. secularization as the main points of differentiation between the political left and right, as in case of Hungary (Körösényi et al., 2009). However, this is not bound so strongly to (sub)ethnic, language and local identities as in Taiwan. Civil and political development in Taiwan would have to leave this pre-democratic pattern behind to unite a nation, a real macro-political community identity, instead of the 'separatist' identity of an island (McAllister, 2016). However, the strong external challenge from the People's Republic of China, among other factors, has formed the dual party system of Taiwan, based upon the issue of separation vs. integration. After the democratic transition, the Kuomintang became the party of understanding and dialogue with China, and the DPP (Lu, 1992) became associated with setting boundaries and demanding guarantees to avoid a too strong and rapid integration with the mainland, which could endanger the results of the democratic transition and consolidation, as well as Taiwanese independence (Bush, 2014). Both parties frame the 'China factor' differently, and analyze and perceive the experience of the Chinese principle of 'one country – two systems' in Hong-Kong and Macau according to their own world view (Ortmann, 2010, 2015; Ngok, 2008).

Statehood as one of the important five realms of democratic consolidation, according to the concept of consolidation developed by Linz & Stepan (1996), is not a fully developed institution in the case of Taiwan due to its lack of sovereignty. State power, in the sense of monopoly of control over the territory, exists, but sovereignty is contested by China and therefore is not acknowledged by the majority of states and international organizations. China implements the 'one China principle' in a very consequential way in bilateral and multilateral relations, due to its growing economic, military and international position of power. The sovereignty of Taiwan is accepted only by a small circle of diplomatic allies (Chu, Moon, 1997). The vast majority of states and international organizations, including the UN, do not accept Taiwanese statehood, unless with the consent/support of PRC and according to its rules, as the 'Chinese Taipei.'

Aurel Croissant (2004), as well as other scholars of the region such as McAllister (2016), consider that Taiwan, alongside South Korea and Mongolia, is one of the best examples of democracy among the Third Wave transition countries in Asia. In his view, the South East Asian new democracies are under constant threat of crisis and internal problems, which is not conducive to the consolidation of democracy. However, he and other analysts have identified problems of freedom of expression, rule of law and horizontal accountability, as well as serious corruption problems, even in these well-performing political systems (Garner, 2011).

Another recent analysis by Larry Diamond and co-authors (2014) stresses that, in Taiwan and South Korea, we are dealing with maturing democracies, which are comparable to the established new democracies in Europe and South America, but, due to the challenges to their statehood/sovereignty, nation-building issues, and policies towards China and North Korea, as well as internal defects in their constitutions, rule of law and polarized party system, they are vulnerable to political crises. The recent political crisis in 2016/17 in South Korea involving the presidency, informal influence, cor-

ruption networks and parallel challenges from the aggressive military policy of North Korea underlined this problem, and made the internal and external problems of South Korean democracy very visible (Diamond, Shin, 2014). The success of demonstrations and rallies against the president in South Korea resulted in the ruling of parliament and Constitutional Court against the corrupt president, and criminal proceedings against former President Pak began, which serves as proof of the strength of civil society and the constitutional order against anti-democratic tendencies.

Concluding this chapter, we may state that Western global concepts of democratization may help to identify similarities and differences, and compare stronger and weaker factors within democratic transitions in Asian and Central and Eastern European Third Wave democracies. Different starting points, similar processes and different outcomes can be identified comparing Central and Eastern Europe and South and East Asia. Facing similar global challenges, some regional patterns of democratization and resulting crises are developing. Central and Eastern Europe was economically marginalized during communist times, whereas some parts of Asia were well integrated into the global economy under authoritarian rule. Europeanization and a favorable external environment helped former communist countries to become oriented towards Western-style rule of law and democracy, and external factors helped Third Wave democracies in Asia, especially South Korea and Taiwan, aided by US and other global economic, military and cultural partnerships, to develop their human rights culture and democracy in the face of their totalitarian counterparts in the Peoples Republic of China and North Korea. This strong conflict was, on the one hand, a reason for the strength of the military and security power in these countries, and on the other hand the external threat strengthened the need to draw dividing lines with the enemy, which helped to establish strong human rights and democratic engagement, combined with a pro-development state supporting world market integration. The democratic development of these two countries is based upon the outward challenge from autocratic regimes and political-military support of democratic regimes such as the US. These developments helped to establish the polarized party systems and political cultures based upon the division of the Chinese and Korean nations.

The tendency towards hybridization among new democracies is globally evident, and consolidation after transition is endangered by the resurgence of populism, nationalism and new authoritarianism. Concepts of competitive authoritarianism (Levitsky, Way, 2010) and of hybrid regimes (Diamond, 2002; Morlino, 2009) help to analyze the different outcomes of democratic transitions. The challenge of hybridization is present in both East Asia and Central and Eastern Europe. Hungary and Taiwan will be compared as two diverging, but in many respects similar, cases of a state with an authoritarian tradition, followed by a democratic transition and various waves of consolidation and de-consolidation.

Some of the general trends of changes in the former underground clandestine protest movements in the new democracies of Hungary and Taiwan

In 1989–1990, the transitions in Taiwan and Hungary had similar characteristics; a peaceful change, rather top-down in nature, withdrawal of the authoritarian system and the organs of repression (army, police, secret service). However, in 1990, in Hungary the

new parties emerging from the opposition movements gained power, whereas the first change from the reformed KMT, Kuomintang to the former underground Danwai- a way similar to Solidarity in Poland- movement party, the Democratic Progressive Party, took place in 2000. There are several reasons why this occurred; in Taiwan, the economic system did not have to be changed, and political power remained with the old ruling elite, while in Hungary, huge economic and social changes led to a change of elites in elections – there were two kinds of transition.

This democratization made possible a long but consequential struggle with the authoritarian past, which led to protest events and the mobilization of social movements after transition in both countries. The main protest events have been demonstrations, memorial meetings, marches related to the former anti-authoritarian struggles or/and for the goals of democratization and national independence in both cases, especially large demonstrations in the capital, or other major cities.[5] Similar dynamics of protest waves can be observed in both cases. Protests tend to be focused on single issues, mainly peaceful, taking the form of demonstrations and strikes, with some conflict centered around civil disobedience and non-conventional action.

The present ruling parties, Democratic Progressive Party in Taiwan, and Fidesz (Alliance of the Young Democrats) in Hungary, both of which emerged from the anti-authoritarian, former opposition-dissent movements before transition, have become major parties and important political actors after transition. They have had to change and be challenged by various new civic protest movements such as Sunflower, Wild Strawberries, and White Shirts in Taiwan, as well as students, environmentalists, or right-and left-wing radicals in Hungary.

In Hungary after the 2010 elections resulted in the Fidesz led hegemonic party system and divided opposition, new extra-parliamentary democratic movements have emerged. These new movements have tried to mobilize active citizens and have worked to build a new political landscape from the bottom up, from civil society. Their mobilization has been directed primarily against the policies of the hegemonic party Fidesz. These new democratic movements are members of, and supported by, international and especially European civic and human rights networks, and are highly Europeanized and globally-oriented. There is civic, political and media pluralism in Hungary, however restricted, as in many other recent competitive-authoritarian or hybrid regimes (Levitsky, Way, 2010; Whitehead, 2016). Peaceful forms of protest can be exercised within the framework of the assembly/demonstration law of 1989/2018, and there are even political and media 'spaces' for civil disobedience. Not only do the ruling majority and its affiliated organizations have a voice in public, but also the old and new protesters. There exists a limited, selective pluralism for protest movements (Jensen, 2015; Szabó, 2015).

In Taiwan, since the system transition, the two main political alternatives have been Chiang Kai-shek's former party, the Kuomintang (KMT), and the party formed from the

---

[5] The research on social movements and protest in Taiwan is based upon on the long term research of Ho and of Hsiao; see Ho (2005, 2014, 2015) Hsiao (1992, 2006). They continue their Taiwan based but Asian comparative research projects involving many Taiwanese and Asian scholars. On Hungary and Poland in East-Central European perspective Ekiert (1996, 2011), Ekiert, Kubik (1998, 2014), as well as Ekiert, Foa (2011, 2017), Miszlivetz (1999), and Jensen (2015), Jensen, Miszlivetz (2006, 2015), works are there as well as the collective volume of Krastev and Til (2015) on Hungary in English and of works of mine Szabó (1996, 2000, 2015).

opposition movements in 1986, the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP). Elections and important government actions and decisions by the DPP presidencies elected in 2000 and 2004 were followed by intra- and extra-parliamentary protest by the KMT. Mobilization of supporters against the democratically elected president and parliament/government were included into the political culture of the new democracy in Taiwan. Moreover, the KMT have built strong ties with PRC and the Chinese Communist Party, and in this way their protests developed a pro-unification, pro-China character. This is an important issue in Taiwan, where the Kuomintang established Republic of China is seen by the mainland "Communist" Chinese elite, and also many Taiwan's citizens, as an illegal separation from the ancient Chinese state. The DPP stands for Taiwanese independence, and after loosing presidential and governmental power in 2008, they supported pro-independence civic movements against the newly re-established KMT government. The DPP in opposition renewed its networks within civil society, which started protest campaigns against the policy failures of the KMT government and president.

The biggest mobilizations successfully campaigned against the lack of human rights for people in military service and the KMT cross strait policy. The KMT government lost its support partly because of the protests and critical discourses on illiberal tendencies within civil and political society. The 'China-factor,' the specific relationship between the KMT and Chinese Communist Party created a 'shadow of China' on the liberal democracy of Taiwan. The electorate at the 2015 municipal/local and the 2016 presidential/parliamentary elections voted with a two-thirds majority for the DPP, and demanded a clear transition towards more independence and autonomy for Taiwan, as well as restoring human rights culture. As well as the victory of DPP, the party of the Sunflower movement, the New People's Party also gained a few seats in the 2016 parliamentary elections. They have tried to bring into public discourse the radical demands of social movements and civic groups. The in 2016 elected DPP government and president aimed to be agents of reform within Taiwanese politics, breaking long-standing deadlocks, such as inquiries into the violence of the authoritarian regime before 1989, reaching a consensus with the colonized aboriginal tribes, reforming the penal system and strengthening human rights and the rule of law. However the independency policy and the distance to China resulted in sever economic losses and the austerity policy provoked huge protests 2016–18 against the DPP government. Civil society activists were disillusioned by the slow and moderate reforms of the rule of law. Both opponents and former supporters alienated from the DPP regime, and wide range of population felt to be worsening its quality of life and economic situation compared to the former KMT regime. The 2018 November local elections produced a landslide victory of the opposition party KMT, huge losses of the DPP in local governments and Prime Minister offered his resignation as well the president gave up the parallel position being the same time DPP party president after the 2018 local elections.

Conclusions

The party system in Taiwan and in Hungary is focused on a central conflict; between the nationalist-illiberal parties of the right and Europe-oriented, liberally-minded left in Hungary, and between the pro-China/nationalist KMT (the Green) and the pro-inde-

pendence, liberal DPP (the Blue) and their allies in Taiwan. These very strong central conflicts have mobilized protest movements led by both parties in both countries, in Hungary as well as in Taiwan. Protest campaigns have contributed to two-thirds majority victories in the next elections for the protesting parties, of Fidesz (2010) in Hungary and of the DPP (2016) in Taiwan. Both parties have tried to use their dominant position at the legislation and the government as well as in the presidency to guarantee their own political future within a bipartisan system, accusing the former governing party of corruption and abuse of power, the KMT in Taiwan and the Socialist and the Liberal parties in Hungary. This fight against the former government parties produced elements of competitive authoritarianism and an uneven playing field for the two main competitors, the Hungarian Socialist Party (MSZP) in Hungary and the KMT in Taiwan. The tendency towards hybridization is very clear in both cases, but especially in Hungary where Fidesz received two-third majority three times on national elections (2010, 2014, 2018) this seems to be a long-term trend in Hungary (Magyar, 2016), but it is not a present danger in the case of Taiwan, where on the 2018 November local elections the opposition party KMT received huge support and the much less supported DPP government and presidency is in crisis in the aftermath of this election. Both parties, Fidesz and the DPP, understand their political success, the two-thirds majorities that they received, as a mandate to finish the democratization processes, which they consider incomplete, in their own way, securing their own continued dominance, and oppressing the former ruling parties with authoritarian past.

Bibliography

Arato A. (1992), *Civil Society in Emerging Democracies: Poland and Hungary*, in: *From Leninism to Freedom*, ed. M. L. Nugent, Westview, Boulder Co., pp. 127–53.

Authoritarism Goes Global (2015), "Journal of Democracy," Special Issue, 26, p. 3.

Bába I. (2016), *The Fall of Communism. Changing the Regimes in Central Europe in 1989–1990*, IASK, Kőszeg

Babayan N., Risse T. (eds.) (2015), *Promotion and the Challenge of Illiberal Regional Powers*, "Democratization," Special Issue 22, p. 3.

Berg-Schlosser D. (2015), *The Impact of the Great Recession on Regime Change Economic and Political Interactions*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," vol. 11, 1, pp. 37–52.

Bozóki A., (2015), *Broken Democracy, Predatory State and Nationalist Populism*, in: *The Hungarian Patient: Social Opposition to an Illiberal Democracy*, eds. P. Krasztev, J. van Til, Central European University Press, Budapest–New York, pp. 3–37.

Bush R. (2014), *China's Rise and Other Global Trends: Implications for Taiwan Democracy*, in: *New Challenges for Maturing Democracies in Korea and Taiwan*, eds. L. Diamond, G. W. Shin, Stanford U.P., Stanford (Cal.), pp. 340–365.

Carothers T. (2002), *The end of the transition paradigm*, "Journal of Democracy," 13, 1, pp. 5–21.

Carothers T. (2015), *Democracy Aid at 25: Time to Choose*, "Journal of Democracy," 26, 1, pp. 59–73.

Carothers T., Brechenmacher S. (2014), *Closing Space. Democracy and Human Rights Support under Fire*, Carnegie Endowment for Peace, Washington D.C.

Cheng T., Haggard S. (eds.) (1992), *Political Change in Taiwan*, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, CO.

Chu Y. (1998), *Taiwan's Unique Challenges*, in: *Democracy in East Asia*, eds. L. Diamond, M. F. Platter, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London, pp. 133–147.

Chu Y., Moon C. (1997), *South Korea and Taiwan: the International Context*, in: eds. D. Larry et al., pp. 267–295.

Cotton J. (1997), *East Asian Democracy: Progress and Limits*, in: *Consolidating Third Wave Democracies*, eds. L. Diamond et al., The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London, pp. 95–123.

Croissant A., Haynes J. (eds.) (2014), *Twenty Years of Studying Democratization*, vol. 1, Routledge, New York.

Croissant A. (2017), *Legitimationsvorteil der Diktatur? Politische Unterstützung und Regimetypen in Asien*, in: *Demokratie, Diktatur und Gerechtigkeit.. Festschrift für Wolfgang Merkel*, eds. A. Croissant, S. Kneip, A. Petring, Wiesbaden, pp. 545–569.

Croissant A. (2004), *From Transition to Defective Democracy: Mapping Asia's Democratization*, "Democratization," 11: 5, pp. 156–178.

Dahrendorf R. (1990), *Betrachtungen über die Revolution in Europa*, DVA, Stuttgart.

Dawisha K., Parrot B. (eds.) (1997), *The consolidation of democracy in East-Central Europe*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Diamond L. (2002), *Thinking About Hybrid Regimes*, "Journal of Democracy," vol. 13: 2, pp. 21–35.

Diamond L., Platter M. F. (eds.) (1998), *Democracy in East Asia*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London.

Diamond L., Shin G. W. (eds.) (2014), *New Challenges for Maturing Democracies in Korea and Taiwan*, Stanford U.P., Stanford (Cal.).

Diamond L., Shin G. W. (2014), *Introduction*, in: *New Challenges for Maturing Democracies in Korea and Taiwan*, eds. L. Diamond, G. W. Shin, Stanford U.P., Stanford (Cal.), pp. 1–27

Diamond L. et al. (eds.) (1997), *Consolidating Third Wave Democracies*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London.

Ekiert G. (2011), *The Illiberal Challenge in Post-Communist Europe*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," vol. 8: 2, pp. 63–77.

Ekiert G., Foa R. S. (2011), *Civil Society Weakness in Post Communist Europe: A Preliminary Assessment*, Collegio Carlo Alberto Papers no. 198, January 2011, www.carloalberto.org/working_papers, retrieved, 2.05.2017.

Ekiert G., Kubik J. (2014), *Myths and Realities of Civil Society*, "Journal of Democracy", 25: 1, pp. 46–58.

Ekiert G., Foa R. S. (2017), *The weakness of post-communist civil society reassessed*, "European Journal of Political Research," 56: 2, pp. 419–440.

Ekiert G. (1996), *The State Against Society*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Ekiert G., Kubik J. (1998), *Contentious Politics in New Democracies: East Germany, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia 1989–1993*, "World Politics," 50(4), pp. 547–581.

Falk B. J. (2003), *The Dilemmas of Dissidence in East Central Europe*, CEU Press, Budapest.

Fodor G. G., Kern T. (2009), *The Crisis of the Regime Change*, Századvég, Budapest.

Frentzel-Zagórska J. (1990), *Civil Society in Poland and Hungary*, "Soviet Studies," vol. 42, no. 4, pp. 759–778.

Fukuyama F. (2012), *China and East Asian Democracy. The Patterns of History*, "Journal of Democracy," 23: 1, pp. 14–24.

Garner J. W. (2011), *Taiwan's Democratic Consolidation*, in: *Taiwan's Democracy. Economic and Political Challenges*, eds. R. Ash, J. W. Garner, P. B. Prime, Routledge, Oxon–New York, pp. 1–35.

Hankiss E. (1990), *East European Alternatives*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Ho Ming-sho (2010), *Understanding the Trajectory of Social Movements in Taiwan (1980–2010)*, "Journal of Current Chinese Affairs," 39: 3, pp. 3–22.

Ho Ming-sho (2014), *The Resurgence of Social Movements under the Ma Ying-jeou Government*, in: *Taiwan President Ma Ying-jeou's First Term in Office (2008–2012)*, eds. J. P. Cabestan, J. de Lisle, Routledge, London, pp. 100–119.

Ho Ming-sho (2005), *Taiwan's State and Social Movements under the DPP Government (2000–2004)*, "Journal of East Asian Studies," 5: 3, pp. 401–425.

Ho Ming-sho (2015), *Occupy Congress in Taiwan: Political Opportunity, Threat, and the Sunflower Movement*, "Journal of East Asian Studies," 15: 1, pp. 69–97.

Hsiao Ming-sho (1992), *The Rise of Social Movements and Civil Protests*, in: *Asian New Democracies: The Philippines, South Korea and Taiwan Compared*, eds. C. Tun-jen, M. Hsiao (2006), Taiwan Foundation for Democracy, Taipei.

Huntington S. P. (1991), *Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*, University of Oklahoma Press, Norman–London.

Jensen J. (2015), *Hungary: Emerging Subterranean Politics and Civil Dissent*, in: *Subterranean Politics in Europe*, eds. M. Kaldor et al., Palgrave MacMillan, New York, pp. 141–167.

Jensen J., Miszlivetz F. (2006), *The Second Renaissance of Civil Society in East Central Europe and in the EU, Global Civil Society: from Dissent to World Bank*, in: *The Languages of Civil Society*, ed. P. Wagner, Berghahn Books, New York, pp. 131–159, 177–206.

Jensen J., Miszlivetz F. (eds.) (2015), *Reframing Europe's Future. Challenges and Failures at the European Construction*, Routledge, New York.

Jones B. C., Su Y. (2015), *Confrontational Contestation and Democratic Compromise: The Sunflower Movement and its Aftermath*, "Hong Kong Law Journal," vol. 45: 1, pp. 193–211.

Klandermans B., Stralen C. van (eds.) (2015), *Movements in Times of Democratic Transition*, Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Körösényi A., Tóth C., Török G. (2009), *The Hungarian Political System*, Hungarian Centre for Democracy Studies Foundation, Budapest.

Krasztev P., Til J. van (eds.) (2015), *The Hungarian Patient. Social opposition to antiliberal democracy*, Central European University Press, New York.

Kuti É., Sebestyén I. (2004), *Boom and Consolidation: the Nonprofit Sector in Hungary*, in: *Future of Civil Society*, eds. A. Zimmer, E. Priller, Making Central European Nonprofit-Organizations Work, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 655–681.

Levitsky S., Way L. A. (2010), *Competitive Authoritarianism. Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

Linz J. J., Stepan A. (1996), *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London.

Linz J. J. (2000), *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder–London, pp. 159–263.

Lu A. Y. (1992), *The Development of DPP*, in: *Political Change in Taiwan*, eds. C. Tun-jen, H. Stephen, Lynne Rienner, Boulder, (CO), pp. 121–149.

Magyar B. (2016), *Post-Communist Mafia State. The Case of Hungary*, CEU Press, Budapest.

McAllister I. (2016), *Democratic Consolidation in Taiwan in Comparative Perspective*, "Asian Journal of Comparative Politics," 1: 1, pp. 44–61.

Merkel W. (2010), *Gegen alle Theorie? Die Konsolidierung der Demokratie in Ostmitteleuropa*, in: *Festschrift für Wolfgang Ismayr*, eds. K. H. Schrenk, M. Soldner, VS Verlag, Wiesbaden, pp. 545–562.

Merkel W. (ed.) (1994), *Systemwechsel 1. Theorien, Ansätze und Konzeptionen*, Leske+Budrich, Opladen.

Michta A. A. (1997), *Democratic Consolidation in Poland after 1989*, in: *The consolidation of democracy in East-Central Europe*, eds. K. Dawisha, B. Parrot, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Mass.), pp. 66–109.

Miszlivetz F. (1999), *Illusions and Realities. The Methamorphosis of Civil Society in a New European Space*, Savaria U.P., Szombathely.

Morlino L. (2009), *Are there Hybrid Regimes?*, "European Political Science Review," vol. 1: 2, pp. 273–296.

Ngok M. (2008), *Civil Society and Democratization in Hong Kong Paradox and Duality*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," 4: 2, pp. 155–175.

Olson D. M. (1997), *Democratization and political participation the Czech Republic*, in: *The consolidation of democracy in East-Central Europe*, eds. K. Dawisha, B. Parrot, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Mass.), pp. 150–197.

Ortmann S. (2010), *Democratization and the Discourse on Stability in Hong Kong and Singapore*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," 10: 1, pp. 123–145.

Ortmann S. (2015), *The Umbrella Movement and Hong Kong s Protracted Democratization Process*, "Asian Affairs," 16: 1, pp. 32–50.

Pei M. (1998), *The Fall and Rise of Democracy in East Asia*, in: *Democracy in East Asia*, eds. L. Diamond, M. F. Platter, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London, pp. 57–79.

Quigley K. F. F. (1997), *Foundations and Democracy Assistance in Central Europe*, The Johns Hopkins University Press/Woodrow Wilson Center Press, Washington–Baltimore.

Renwick A. (2014), *Why Hungary and Poland Differed in 1989*, in: *Twenty Years of Studying Democratization*, vol. 1, eds. A. Croissant, J. Haynes, Routledge, New York, pp. 1–23.

Schedler A. (2017), *Taking Uncertainty Seriously: The Blurred Boundaries of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, in: *Twenty Years of Studying Democratization*, vol. 1, eds. A. Croissant, J. Haynes, Routledge, New York, pp. 77–99.

Schmitter P. C., Schneider C. Q. (2014), *Liberalization, Transition and Consolidation*, in: *Twenty Years of Studying Democratization*, vol. 1, eds. A. Croissant, J. Haynes, Routledge, New York, pp. 45–77.

Schmitter P. C. (1997), *Civil Society in East and West*, in: *Consolidating Third Wave Democracies*, eds. L. Diamond et al., The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London, pp. 239–263.

Schreier C. (ed.) (2015), *25 Years After. Mapping Civil Society in the Visegrád Countries*, Lucius & Lucius Verlag, Stuttgart, pp. 9–59.

Shin Doc. C. (2008), *The Third Wave in East Asia. Comparative and Dynamic Perspectives*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," 4: 2, pp. 91–131.

Shin Doc. C., Kim H. J. (2016), *Liberal Democracies as the End of History. Western Theories versus Eastern Asian Realities*, "Asian Journal of Comparative Politics," 1: 4, pp. 1–21.

Soest C., Whitehead L. (eds.) (2015), *Forum Section: Authoritarianism, Democracy Prevention. The international collaboration of authoritarian regimes*, "European Journal of Political Research," 54: 4, pp. 623–707.

Szabó M. (1996), *Repertoires of Contention in Post-Communist Protest Cultures*, "Social Research," 63(4), pp. 1155–1183.

Szabó M. (2015), *From Anticommunist Dissident Movement to Governing Party: the Transformations of Fidesz in Hungary*, in: *Movements in Times of Democratic Transition*, eds. B. Klandermans, C. van Stralen, Temple University Press, Philadelphia, pp. 301–316.

Szabó M. (2000), *Some Lesson of Collective Protests in Central European Post-Communist Countries*, "East Central Europe," vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 59–77.

Tökés R. (1996), *Hungary's Negotiated Revolution. 1957–1990*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Mass.).

Whitehead L. (2014), *Antidemocracy Promotion. Four Strategies in Search of a Framework*, "Taiwan Journal of Democracy," 10: 2, pp. 1–24.

Whitehead L. (2016), *25 Years of Freedom, and Various Shades of Grey*, "Central European Political Science Review," 17: 63, pp. 11–31.

Wu P., Jiang Wei (1992), *The Changing Role of the KMT*, in: *Political Change in Taiwan*, eds. T. Cheng, S. Haggard, Lynne Rienner, Boulder (CO), pp. 75–95.

Regionalny rozwój demokratyzacji i społeczeństwa obywatelskiego: transformacja, konsolidacja, hybrydyzacja, globalizacja – Tajwan i Węgry

Streszczenie

Porównanie Europy Środkowej i Wschodniej z Azją Południową pozwala określić ich punkty startu obu regionów, podobne procesy i zróżnicowane wyniki. Oba regiony borykają się z podobnymi globalnymi wyzwaniami, realizują regionalne wzorce demokratyzacji i stają w obliczu kryzysów. W czasach komunistycznych Europa Środkowo-Wschodnia była ekonomicznie marginalizowana w gospodarce światowej, podczas gdy niektóre znajdujące się pod rządami autorytarnymi regiony Azji dobrze zintegrowały się z gospodarką globalną. Europeizacja i sprzyjające otoczenie zewnętrzne zachęciły byłe kraje komunistyczne do wyboru rządów prawa i demokracji typu zachodniego. Inne czynniki zewnętrzne pomogły demokracji „trzeciej fali" w Azji, zwłaszcza w Korei Południowej i na Tajwanie, które skorzystały ze wsparcia ze strony Stanów Zjednoczonych i innych globalnych partnerstw gospodarczych, wojskowych i kulturalnych, pozwalających im rozwinąć swoją kulturę praw człowieka i demokrację, stojąc twarzą w twarz z totalitarnymi odpowiednikami – Chińską Republiką Ludową i Koreą Północną. Odmienne pozycje Tajwanu i Węgier w ich regionach wynikają z różnych zdolności zarządzania transformacją w latach 1988–89. Tajwan zdołał zachować swoją wiodącą rolę i utrzymać stabilną demokrację, pomimo zagrożenia suwerenności ze strony Chińskiej Republiki Ludowej. Węgry nigdy nie miały tak wpływowego i problematycznego sąsiada, a gwarantem ich bezpieczeństwa i partnerstwa w drodze do dobrobytu była Unia Europejska – czynnik nieobecny w Tajwanie. Podczas gdy poziom bezpieczeństwa na Tajwanie był niższy, panujące tam warunki ekonomiczne i społeczne były bardziej korzystne dla demokratyzacji niż na Węgrzech. Węgry z kolei miały wiodącą pozycję w procesach demokratyzacji w czasach postkomunistycznej transformacji, którą utraciły w czasie kryzysu i konfliktów w ostatniej dekadzie (po 2006 r., a zwłaszcza od 2010 r.). Mimo że liberalizacja przygotowała grunt pod pokojowe przemiany w obu krajach i doprowadziła do podobnych procesów demokratycznej konsolidacji w latach 90. dwudziestego wieku, Węgry dołączyły do grupy przegranych w swoim regionie, podczas gdy Tajwan jest jednym z głównych liderów w swoim regionie. Tajwan w chwili obecnej rozpoczyna kompleksowe reformy zmierzające do wzmocnienia demokracji, praw obywatelskich i praworządności, a węgierski rozwój jest krytykowany przez wielu zewnętrznych i wewnętrznych analityków jako odejście od ścieżki demokracji skonsolidowanych typu europejskiego w kierunku nieliberalnych trendów i hybrydyzacji. Zachodnie globalne koncepcje demokratyzacji mogą pomóc zidentyfikować podobieństwa i różnice oraz porównać mocniejsze i słabsze czynniki przemian demokratycznych w Azji i Europie w ramach demokracji trzeciej fali.

Słowa kluczowe: demokratyzacja, hybrydyzacja, rozwój regionalny, Europa Środkowa, Azja Wschodnia, demokracja, system partyjny, protest polityczny, ruchy społeczne, mobilizacja, autorytaryzm, autorytaryzm konkurencyjny